UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
*	* *
RALPH R. KAMINSKI,	
Plaintiff/Counter-defendant, )	3:11-cv-00493-LRH-RAM
v. )	
BETTY KAMINSKI, et al.,	<u>ORDER</u>
Defendants/Counter-claimants.	
)	
Plaintiff Ralph R. Kaminski initiated this	action in the Ninth Judicial District Court for
Douglas County, Nevada. On May 17, 2011, Plaintiff was served with a counterclaim by	
Defendants Betty Kaminski and Charles Kaminski	ci. On July 13, 2011, in his stated capacity as
"Counterdefendant," Plaintiff filed a notice of rer	noval to this court based on diversity jurisdiction
Doc. #1.1	
"[A]ny civil action brought in a State cour	rt of which the district courts of the United States
have original jurisdiction, may be removed by the	e defendant or the defendants, to the district court
of the United States for the district where such	h action is pending." 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). After
a defendant files a petition for removal, the court	must determine whether federal jurisdiction
exists, even if no objection is made to removal. S	See Rains v. Criterion Systems, Inc., 80 F.3d 339,
<sup>1</sup> Refers to the court's docket entry number	
	RALPH R. KAMINSKI,  Plaintiff/Counter-defendant,  V.  BETTY KAMINSKI, et al.,  Defendants/Counter-claimants.  Plaintiff Ralph R. Kaminski initiated this  Douglas County, Nevada. On May 17, 2011, Pla  Defendants Betty Kaminski and Charles Kaminski  "Counterdefendant," Plaintiff filed a notice of rer  Doc. #1.¹  "[A]ny civil action brought in a State counterdefendant jurisdiction, may be removed by the of the United States for the district where such a defendant files a petition for removal, the courtexists, even if no objection is made to removal.

## Case 3:11-cv-00493-LRH-RAM Document 5 Filed 07/22/11 Page 2 of 2

1	342 (9th Cir. 1996). "If it appears that the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, the
2	case shall be remanded." 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). "Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is
3	any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance." Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566
4	(9th Cir. 1992) (citing Libhart v. Santa Monica Dairy Co., 592 F.2d 1062, 1064 (9th Cir. 1979)).
5	Upon review of the petition for removal and accompanying exhibits, the court finds that
6	Plaintiff is not a "defendant" authorized to remove the case to federal court under 28 U.S.C. §
7	1441(a), despite his status as a counterclaim defendant. "Since Shamrock Oil, the law has been
8	settled that a counterclaim defendant who is also a plaintiff to the original state action may not
9	remove the case to federal court." Westwood Apex v. Contreras, F.3d, 2011 WL 1744960,
10	*5 (9th Cir. May 2, 2011) (referencing Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp. v. Sheets, 313 U.S. 100 (1941))
11	Because Plaintiff had no right of removal, the court lacks jurisdiction and remand is required.
12	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this case is remanded to the Ninth Judicial District
13	Court for Douglas County, Nevada.
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.
15	DATED this 22nd day of July, 2011.
16	
17	LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	